

*REMARKS/ARGUMENTS*

*Summary of the Office Action*

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 have been rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 13, 15, 16, and 17 of U.S. Patent 7,229,635 ("the '635 patent"). Reconsideration of the pending claims is hereby requested.

*Discussion of the Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection*

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 have been rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 13, 15, 16, and 17 of the '635 patent. While the claims are not identical to one another, the Examiner asserts that pending claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are not patentably distinct from claims 1, 4, 13, 15, 16, and 17 of the '635 patent.

In order to advance prosecution of the instant application, and not in acquiescence of the rejection, Applicant submits herewith a Terminal Disclaimer Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.321 for the instant application and the '635 patent. Accordingly, the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is believed to be moot, and Applicant requests its withdrawal.

*Conclusion*

Applicant respectfully submits that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent.

Respectfully submitted,



Kristen J. Harrell, Ph.D., Reg. No. 51,783  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: October 6, 2008